DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 404 452 CE 073 361

AUTHOR Kime, Steve F.; Anderson, Clinton L.
TITLE Education vs. Training: A Military Perspective.
INSTITUTION Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 97
NOTE 19p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Articulation (Education); *Continuing Education; *Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; *General Education; Higher Education; *Military Personnel; *Military Training; Needs Assessment; Position Papers; *Role of Education; Training Objectives

ABSTRACT

Civilian educators have long argued that the U.S. armed forces must be maintained as a reflection of society and that civilian education institutions must share responsibility in educating servicemembers. Political changes and technological advances have made education a strategic issue in structuring military forces for the third millennium. In recognition of its need for college-capable individuals, the military is now promising postsecondary educational opportunities to college-capable recruits. Adult and continuing education in the military performs three basic functions: it supports recruitment, retention, and job placement; it supplements/complements military training; and it helps fulfill individual human aspirations for education. Some military leaders recognize that servicemembers need "intellectual agility" along with military skills. The challenge for higher education in serving the military is to provide servicemember-students with high-quality degree programs comparable to similar on-campus programs (including adult or continuing education) for traditional students. Civilian education programs for servicemembers should be program oriented, emphasize transferability of credits, link operational experience and individual self-development, be tailored to educational requirements, meet the needs and educational aspirations of minorities and women, encourage cooperative higher education planning and commitment, help veterans make the transition from active to reserve and civilian status, and encourage servicemembers' self-development. (Contains 21 references.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 404 452

Education vs. Training:

A Military Perspective

by

Steve F. Kime

Director

Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges

and

Clinton L. Anderson

Senior Consultant

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S Kime

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges
One Dupont Circle, Suite 680
Washington, DC 20036-1117

800/368-5622 · 202/667-0079 · FAX: 202/667-0622 · E-Mail: SOC_Mail@aascu.nche.edu

DISCLAIMER

This paper is the product of the author(s). It has neither been coordinated with nor approved by any element within the Department of Defense.

CE 073 341

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Education vs. Training:
A Military Perspective

Introduction

There is a natural tension between military trainers and those who advocate civilian educational opportunities for service personnel. This tension is aggravated by the tendency of trainers to use the terminology of higher education and by the temptation to justify the expense of investment in distance delivery and advanced instructional technology by applying that technology to higher education. The corporate view of these matters is blurred at best. Confusion reigns over distinctions between education and training, and this confusion is increased as the adult education revolution and the technological revolution each asserts itself.

This paper focuses on various aspects of the education vs. training issue. "Military training," as used here, refers to the military's job-oriented training aimed at the accomplishment of tasks associated with the military mission. Some of this training is included in what the military calls "military education," which includes advanced military schooling for officers and senior enlisted personnel. "Education," as used here, means education as it is normally understood in academe, and is what is intended by Congress to be provided by the DoD Voluntary Education Program. As educators who have worked many years in the military and who work now with the National Center for Higher Education, these authors examine the purpose and the development of adult and continuing education within the military corporate body and describe the education vs. training issue in the context of the partnership between the United States higher education community and the military services.

Education as a Strategic Issue

Civilian educators have long held strong views about the education of the military. The argument that our military must be maintained as a reflection of society and that civilian education institutions have a responsibility in the education of servicemembers is familiar. A good case can be made that the Founding Fathers intended the country's defense to be in the hands of citizen-soldiers trained by the military, but educated in civil society. In any case, Congress has rarely and with reluctance approved degree-granting authority to Defense Department programs. This is recognition of the fact that colleges and universities in the United States have a very important role to play in the education of servicemembers.

The issue of education for servicemembers has been broadened as the potential use of military force has grown more complex both technically and politically. It is no longer a question of, *if* the servicemember is educated, but whether he or she should be educated in civil society. There is a growing school of thought that the servicemember **must** be both educated and trained. The argument that soldiers only need to learn to follow orders or worse, to be "trained to kill," is becoming increasingly anachronistic in the late 20th century. Still, its adherents persist. An example is a recent *Army Times* commentary where it was argued that "...enlisted soldiers do not have to be degree-toting, highly educated folks....The job of enlisted soldiers is to perform the tasks required to get the job done in accordance with the orders and policies of their commanding officer" (Kulas, 1997). One author of this paper answered that "The nation needs servicemembers who are both educated and trained. The way military force is used these days — in highly charged and complex 'peacetime' politico-military environments — clearly requires more than a military man or woman narrowly attuned to a combat task" (Kime, 1997).

Education is a **strategic** issue in structuring the military forces for the third millennium. Training for any purpose now will be effective only if the trainee is adequately educated. The lines formerly drawn between those who need "education" and those who need "training" have become blurred, if not irrelevant. Education without training in the combat arms has always been correctly understood as folly in the military. Now the military must come to grips with the fact that we cannot train the uneducated.

To be educated, and thus capable of training for modern combat tasks, the American servicemember must be literate in the language and technology of the present and be able to sense and adapt to fast-moving, sometimes unpredictable, technical and sociopolitical change. Once trained to perform in support of military missions, the servicemember must also be an educated person. Critical thinking and interpretive skills based on both broad and technical education are requirements of the modern battlefield and of the "peacetime" environments into which we place enlisted personnel as well as officers. The servicemember of the future has to be as much a thinker as a doer.

A 1989 study that focused on low-aptitude recruits points to the need to recruit men and women with the capacity to learn:

> ...with a reduction in the proportion of personnel needed to fill general, low- or non-technical jobs, and with increasing technological sophistication, the Services have become

> more and more choosy about the quality of the force. Attempts to enhance military effectiveness revolve around recruiting the best-qualified youth who have the potential to quickly absorb training, perform well in their jobs, and become effective leaders (Laurence, et. al., 1989, p. 2).

The military Services in recognition of the fact that college-capable men and women are needed, now focus recruiting on those who should be able to do college work (Komarow, 1997). They do not always succeed because of failures in the nation's secondary school system, but the Services do **promise** postsecondary educational opportunity in order to attract the college-capable recruits they need. This **promise is only meaningful if the recruit has a legitimate opportunity to advance beyond military training** to college-level coursework and degree programs. If the promise is not honored, the Services will fail to develop the kind of servicemembers needed today, and the ability to recruit the people needed to operate a modern military establishment in the future will suffer. This is a major strategic issue.

Military Training

Military training programs of the Armed Services can be discussed and classified in many different ways and from many points of view. Military training, aimed at the accomplishment of tasks associated with the military mission, includes introduction into military life, training in a specific military specialty, and development of the servicemember for responsibilities as a leader and for specialized duties and functions. Military training can be categorized as training and specialized education of enlisted personnel; officer training and specialized education; professional military education; and unit training.

The FY 1996 *Defense Almanac* quantifies "military training" in terms of "168,975 training loads"(American Forces Information Services, 1996, p. 33). "Training loads" are the average number of students and trainees participating in formal training and education courses during the Fiscal Year 1996. Training loads are the equivalent of student/trainee man-years for the participants, including both those in temporary duty and permanent change-of-station status (see figure). Formal military training, described above, represents only a small faction of the overall training effort when compared to training that occurs outside the military training base as servicemembers serve in their units and hone their skills and knowledge essential for the performance of their military jobs.

Figure 1
FY 1996 DoD Training Loads

WHO TRAINS			TYPES OF TRAINING	
Active Forces	Army	51,639	Recruit	32,711
	Navy	40,229	One-Station Unit Training	9,487
	Marine Corps	19,988	Officer Acquisition	19,089
	Air Force	26,868	Specialized Skill	91,323
Total Active		138,724	Flight	4,063
Reserve Component		30,252	Professional Development	12,302
Total		168,975	Total	168,975

Source: American Forces Information Services, 1996, p. 33.

The military might be described as a huge, highly specialized, complex "corporation" that seeks to train its personnel to accomplish tasks associated with the corporate mission. It is the *institution's* mission that is and should be served by the corporation's training. The *individual's* goals and the worker's broadening, aspirations, and personal development, though sometimes served, are not what the training is all about. In the aggregate, military service training programs are designed to convert young civilians to military life, train them as military specialists and/or military leaders, and then develop those selected through a systematic career progression as servicemembers are prepared for higher skill levels and greater leadership responsibilities. This is a vitally important "corporate" goal that serves the national interest. Individual education that occurs in this process is secondary and must be handled with sophistication and care.

Some corporate training, and especially military training, involves learning that has recognized academic value. One of the greatest outcomes thus far of the adult and continuing education revolution is precisely this recognition. Some of the learning that is required in a degree program that has been properly designed by and is monitored in the academic community does occur in the process of training. Specifically, military learning is carefully assessed by those who teach the same subject matters in academe and appropriate academic credit is recommended by the American Council on Education (American Council on Education, 1996).

The process here is very important. The "corporation" is NOT in the education business. It is educators — products of and active participants in the processes of academe — who determine

the academic creditworthiness of learning. It is appropriate that the same educators who determine the standards and requirements of academic degrees for civilians in regionally accredited civilian colleges and universities should make the determinations and enforce the standards in academic degree programs for servicemembers.

The Place of Adult and Continuing Education in the Military

Adult and continuing education in the military performs three basic functions: first, it supports recruitment, retention and job placement, hence it serves a military personnel management function; second, it supplements and complements military training, hence it serves a military training or operations function; and third, it helps fulfill individual human aspirations for education, hence it serves a human resource development function. Adult and continuing education does not fit neatly into any specific military staff element, and it is neither large nor important enough to constitute a separate military staff proponent agency.

Some military commanders see in-service education programs and education of staff personnel simply as a training support vehicle to help enlisted personnel, particularly the NCOs, do their military jobs. This belief is reflected in the struggle over which military staff agency should serve as the proponent for adult and continuing education. This struggle is largely over whether or not adult and continuing education is a function integral to military training or something to be kept separate and distinct. This is a classic battle for the "soul" of voluntary education in the military.

Advocacy for Army education began with the chaplains during the Revolutionary War. In 1778 General George Washington recognized that his soldiers needed to be able to read. So in that frigid winter at Valley Forge he directed his chaplain to provide instruction to the illiterate, convalescent soldiers. The purpose of that instruction had nothing to do with any specific literacy requirement to perform military jobs. Instead, it was aimed at providing enlisted men with the ability to read their Bibles in hopes of spiritual enrichment and a better life in the future. Not surprisingly the chaplains were formally charged with this education responsibility. Washington's initial efforts were later incorporated into a 1839 statute permitting "the administrative council at each Army post to hire a chaplain who would also act as a schoolmaster." Later, the Army made the morale builders the education proponent, then it turned education over to the information specialists. For a short period in World War II general education was integral to military training. Finally, in 1956, the Army made its personnel managers responsible for education and civilianized the Education Services Officer positions.

From time to time, some of major Army commands have given the function to its operations staff to serve as part of military training.

In 1976 and 1977, as the Army looked to systematize the education program and create the Army Continuing Education System, a review was conducted to determine what staff agency should serve as the proponent for education. In weighing all the arguments, the Director of Education for Headquarters Department of the Army wrote:

> Education enhances training and develops better soldiers who have higher morale and fewer disciplinary and leadership problems. It also adds diversity to training programs. I also agree that education should be integrated with training programs and benefit from duty scheduling. This is a mechanical planning problem. But to be successful, the education system must be integrated with the military personnel management function and be a direct support of the recruiting effort. Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, it must be perceived by individual soldiers as both voluntary and personalized in nature. This is reflected in recruiting publicity and we should, at all costs, maintain the credibility of our advertising. We must not inadvertently create the perception that education "is just another Army training program" (Waggener, 1976, pp.1-2).

The personnel staff within the Army has prevailed as the education proponent, to date. Nevertheless, the struggle persists. During late 1989 the United States Army, Europe, where the education program is administratively subordinate to training, announced that tuition assistance would be limited to educational programs that are job-related. Other sources within the Army periodically support development of degree programs specifically designed to correct training weaknesses. These initiatives are aimed at encouraging training proponent agencies to designate vocational associate degrees that they expect their soldiers to complete during their military career.

Over the years, the purpose of adult and continuing education in the military has been to prepare servicemembers for lifetime careers; i.e., careers in or out of the military and likely to encompass responsibilities beyond technical specialties learned relatively early in military service. Academic degree programs have been combined with military training and military education to enable the individual to develop to his or her greatest potential. Even though a blending of learning is expected and highly desired, most postsecondary programs are conducted and managed outside the control of the military training community. The training goals and

objectives of an organization or an employer often differ from the educational needs and personal aspirations of the employee or, in this case, the servicemember.

Perhaps a stronger argument that should sway the most cold-hearted budgeteer is the argument that training goals also differ from the educational goals that the *military services* need for the servicemember to fulfill . Billions of dollars are spent for military training. The fear among educators is that military trainers might divert scarce education resources to supplement those billions to pay for and manage military training. That would serve neither the servicemember nor the Service well.

Higher Education and War-Fighting

It is encouraging that some military leaders understand that units cannot solely be trained to "take the hill" or "storm the beach." Servicemembers in today's military forces are called upon often to engage in operations requiring considerable discretion and careful orchestration. Marine Corps Commandant General Charles Krulak has recognized this. He emphasizes "intellectual agility" as an attribute essential for his marines (Newman, 1996, p 33).

Marine General Krulak's understanding of "intellectual agility" is an exception. Education is not commonly a high priority for operationally-minded military decision makers. In fact, there will be a great temptation to whittle away at the college programs available to servicemembers as budget cuts are made. However, rather than absorb or reduce education dollars, commanders and senior civilians in the Defense Department budget process are better advised to treat education programs as the *foundation* for combat training and military leadership (Kime, 1990). This also means resisting the temptation to view the matter exactly backwards and try to treat education as the mere extension of training. There might be attempts to simply issue academic degrees for military training, or to contract for educational institutions to do the training under the guise of education.

Education programs in the military must promote serious education; that is they must contain a blend of practical subjects and opportunities to widen the servicemember's intellectual horizons. The outlook and skills of the broadly educated, not just the technically trained, are needed. It will require the attention of sophisticated policy-makers to ensure that this is understood. When the going gets tough in the budget battles, as it inevitably will, advocates for education must insist that vigorous adult and continuing education programs are essential from the moment of

recruitment and throughout the career of servicemembers to broaden and deepen both their technical expertise and their understanding of the world in which they live.

How much should education be used to support military training? To what extent will colleges and universities and their accrediting agencies allow their degree programs to become military training programs? What aspects of higher education can be used to enhance war-fighting capabilities? Questions abound!

Vocational educational programs that develop specific technical skills and knowledge needed by military personnel enhance war-fighting capabilities. Military trainers can readily identify with these programs and courses since they look and "smell" similar to military job training conducted in military service schools. Thousands of military jobs have civilian counterparts, such as military police or a food service specialist. A licensed practical nurse is basically the same in a civilian hospital as in a military hospital.

But many military jobs such as infantryman or field artillery cannon crew member do not have civilian counterparts. Some jobs are highly technical, at levels comparable with postsecondary education. For example, an associate degree in Military Electromechanical and Hydraulic Maintenance Technology may fit a soldier, sailor or airman engaged in military jobs involving maintenance of missile, rocket, artillery gun carriers, but such a degree may not adequately prepare the servicemember for a lifetime career, in or out of military service, where broader perspectives and perhaps capacities for management and leadership will be called for. A degree of this sort can be achieved by simply placing credits earned from military training and military job performance in a degree plan along with a minimum number of general education requirements, many of which can be achieved through standardized testing (CLEP, DSST, or ACT/PEP), but is this the optimal blending of traditional and nontraditional education? True, the servicemember can receive an associate degree from a regionally accredited college. Also true, this degree allows the servicemember to be competitive for promotion purposes. It is surely military job-related and its title reflects precisely its vocational orientation. But what has the accomplishment of this degree done to enhance the war-fighting capabilities of the military warrior that a military school certificate does not do? Perhaps it may show that the recipient is literate and can read and understand military technical manuals, but unless the state requires passing some literacy test before this degree is conferred, even this basic expectation may not be served very well.

There is always a danger of creating vocational degrees that are merely academic credentials for military training programs with minimal consideration given to basic principles of adult and continuing education such as emphasis on self-directedness and self-responsibility for learning, and the centrality of human freedom and self-fulfillment. Instrumental learning associated with technical skills and knowledge does little to account for the higher levels of learning such as dialogic and reflective learning that facilitate thinking and action based on available information (Mezirow, 1985).

As stated earlier, a good argument can be made that education that is not strictly job-related is needed to enhance the war-fighting capabilities that a modern nation will require in the Third Millennium. Education might be needed to do more than provide capacities to cope with complex modern technology and politics. At least one report found within the Army Research Institute's files warns military leaders that social and ideological factors will severely hamper the war-fighting spirit of the 21st Century. Much of the population expected to help fight a future war will use drugs, will lack a positive work ethic or, for that matter, conventional ethics in general and will be infected by an insidious, pervading attitude that the future is doomed (live for today-do drugs-sex strictly for recreation-stay high-for tomorrow we die syndrome) (Andrulius, 1982). Although not as graphic or specific, Air Force research also finds the greatest challenge in the 21st Century for the military service is instilling a war-fighting spirit (Department of the Air Force, 1983). Can adult and continuing education help combat this cultural malaise? It certainly can! It can help servicemembers better understand and appreciate the world they live in and be willing to preserve, even better it.

Education's purpose traditionally in the military has been to prepare servicemembers for lifetime careers. The proper focus on communication skills, mathematics, arts and humanities, natural science, social sciences — the very foundation of an educated person — can help servicemembers build a useful skills and knowledge base but, more importantly, an attitude of self-confidence and self-worth. Adult and continuing education can inspire servicemembers to reach out and make a future for themselves and their families. When tied to a major such as management or a specific technology, adult and continuing education can help build technical and tactical proficiency that complements military training, but not be co-opted by it. Lifelong learning is a requirement for servicemembers in order to reach their greatest potential— a lifetime career of service. Is war-fighting in the Third Millennium worth the human sacrifice such as given in World War I and World War II? Unless servicemembers understand freedom, democracy, and the importance of informed citizens, or if they have no stake in the future,

perhaps not! Degree programs that incorporate a solid mixture of courses in the humanities and social sciences such as history, political science, and government could help!

The human being needs to be able to gather and digest essential information, make decisions based on that information, take action, receive the results of that action, gather additional information, make more decisions, take action, etc., until the objective or goal is accomplished or the battle is won! Servicemembers on the extended battlefields of the 21st Century cannot function merely as trained robots. If treated as such by their trainers, these warriors will be woefully inadequate on a modern, highly technical battlefield. Adult and continuing education can hone servicemembers' ability to think and to persevere. These are essential qualities both for maintaining the peace and for prevailing in a future conflict.

The Challenge for Higher Education to Serve the Military Student

The challenge for higher education in serving the military is to provide servicemember-students with high-quality degree programs comparable to similar on-campus programs for traditional students. Often these programs are considered "adult"and/or "continuing" education. Stephen Brookfield describes adult education as:

> a transactional dialogue between participants who bring to the encounter experiences, attitudinal sets, differing ways of looking at their personal, professional, political and recreational worlds, and a multitude of varying purposes, orientations and expectations. Central to this transaction is the continuous negotiation of goals, methods, curricula and evaluative criteria. Adult educators are not blank ciphers through whom are uncritically transmitted the demands and wishes of learners, but neither are they authoritarian ideologues who prescribe curricula and methods which are to be considered fixed and immutable. In a fully adult educational encounter all participants learn, no one member is regarded as having a monopoly on insight, and dissension and criticism are regarded as inevitable and desirable elements of the process (Brookfield, 1985, p. 49).

Brookfield outlines six principles of critical practice in adult education:

- First, participation is voluntary; adults are engaged in learning as a result of their own volition.
- Second, respect for self-worth; an attention to increasing adults' sense of self-worth underlies all educational efforts.

- Third, adult education is collaborative; teachers and learners are engaged in a cooperative enterprise in which, in different times and for different purposes, leadership and facilitation roles will be assumed by different group members.
- Fourth, praxis is at the heart of adult education; participants are involved in a constant process of activity, further reflection on activity and collaborative analysis and so on.
- Fifth, adult education fosters a spirit of critical reflection; through education learners come to appreciate that values, beliefs and behaviors are culturally constructed and transmitted, and that they are provisional and relative.
- Sixth, the aim of adult education is the nurturing of self-directed, empowered adults; such adults will see themselves as proactive, initiating individuals engaged in a continuous re-creation of their personal relationships, work worlds, and social circumstances, and not as reactive individuals, buffeted by the uncontrollable forces of circumstance (Brookfield, 1985, p.48).

In essence, adult education is focused on encouraging military students to become autonomous learners while empowering them with knowledge, skills and understanding needed for working and living in the military and in society in general.

Because voluntary activity, autonomous learning, critical thinking, and the questioning that inevitably accompanies broadened knowledge and understanding are at odds with the age-old image of the ideal warrior, it is no surprise that the proponents of adult and continuing education in the military are often challenged by powerful forces in the military. It is the responsibility of these proponents to meet these challenges when they arise, and make the case that, in spite of the natural tension between them, education as well as training is needed in a modern military.

The Basic Educational Skills Problem

Part of the challenge of providing meaningful postsecondary education to servicemembers is in danger of being overlooked. The failure of the nation's secondary schools, alluded to earlier, is a serious problem to the military. Out of a total of 1,233,549 enlisted personnel on active duty as of May 1996, only 18,724 (1.5 percent) had less than a high school diploma or a GED. Yet, many military leaders in the field or aboard ships find that their servicemembers lack the basic academic skills needed to perform their military jobs and proceed up the systematic career progression ladder. Military commanders, similar to their civilian employer counterparts, want and value servicemembers who have skills and competence in communication, adaptability,

problem-identification and problem-solving, self-management, academic basics, teamwork and leadership.

The trouble is that a high school diploma does not guarantee mastery of basic skills, certainly not the so-called higher order of basic skills (e.g., abilities to think and reason, problem solve, etc.). Some with diplomas still cannot read and write well enough to succeed in advanced training and specialty job performance in our modern military establishment. These unfortunates, like generations before them that joined the nation's Services to do something with their lives unattainable in the civilian world, still need basic skills! There may be fewer of them than in the past, but this need has not entirely disappeared and perhaps never will. The lowest academic layer of the new recruit population may never be able to take advantage of educational opportunity. The military will do well to improve basic skills enough to ensure basic training.

There is a middle academic layer in the new recruit population that must be addressed, because the voluntary postsecondary education needed to make these recruits effective modern servicemembers is attainable. Many of the nation's high school graduates who elect to join the military are not ready for what is generally considered "college-level" work. They can read and manipulate whole numbers, and more than likely play computer games with great skill and agility. But their writing, mathematics, English, and computer skills need much work before they can develop into effective leaders and managers of sophisticated people and equipment. There is a large and growing need for developmental education to prepare these people for a career both within the military and in the civilian world.

Those needing developmental work often seem to fall into a gap in the military's structure for education. There are strong advocates for basic skills, vestigial remains of the era when high percentages of recruits needed that help. There are advocates of college programs ready to receive the servicemember-student as soon as she or he can do college-level work. While the growing need for developmental education is beginning to be recognized, there is not yet strong institutional advocacy for such programs and for the funding needed to make those programs readily available throughout the military organization. Who, for example, will press for tuition assistance for developmental college courses that do not yield college credit?

There are also problems of perception. How do high school graduates come to understand that it is necessary for them to take "developmental" courses before going on with a college education? It was always difficult to "sell" basic skills as an attractive option, and it may be just as difficult to promote developmental coursework. If it is true that the military of the future should consist

of college-capable people, whether or not developmental courses should be required becomes a real issue. This in turn involves that fine line between education and training, and all the real and perceived difficulties that come with crossing that line. The requirements for developmental education must be identified, and the associated issues addressed at policy-making levels, so that we can get on with programs that will work.

Conclusion: What is Needed?

Strong advocacy for the education of servicemembers is needed. This advocacy, like General Krulak's "intellectual agility," must be based upon a deep understanding of both the symbiosis and the differences between voluntary postsecondary education and military training. Senior policy makers must understand the basic strategic issues involved and recognize that, though there is natural tension between voluntary postsecondary education and military training, both require senior policy support.

Because training will and always should be the first priority in a military establishment, a sophisticated policy approach means taking great care to nourish and protect higher educational opportunity. Training is properly huge in terms of its powerful advocates and massive funding, but its command and bureaucratic "weight" in the policy making process can overwhelm the relatively small but essential programs for higher education. This is not because operational commanders do not understand and value educational opportunity, but it is a fact of life in the military. Advocacy for higher education belongs on the personnel side of the military policy making structure where recruiting, retention and development of individuals are priorities, and where, as a "quality of life" matter, voluntary postsecondary education can thrive.

Also needed is a vigorous partnership between the Department of Defense and higher education. In order to ensure that the special needs of the servicemember are understood and accommodated as much as possible, and to ensure also that the standards and requirements of the academic process in the country are adhered to, this partnership is essential. Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges and its several projects and programs are uniquely structured and maintained at the National Center for Higher Education for this purpose, as are the Military Evaluations Program and Military Installation Voluntary Evaluation Review (MIVER) Project at the American Council on Education. Continued, even increased, support for and advocacy of such institutions will help to make certain that the fragile but symbiotic relationship between military training and higher education continues to work effectively in the interest of both the military institution and the individual military learner.

Once educational programs are properly situated and advocated in the policy-making structure they must be carefully monitored by all concerned to ensure that they are tailored to servicemembers' needs and to the unique demands imposed by military service. Education opportunities in the military must be the product of a blend of traditional and nontraditional educational resources into credible education programs that address the needs of service personnel and are available by a variety of instructional delivery options.

These education programs should:

- be program-oriented (not just offering a variety of academic or technical courses);
- give priority consideration to the transferability of credits and limit academic residency requirements;
- tie together individual training, operational experience and individual self- development, providing academic programs equal to those in the civilian academic community;
- be tailored to educational (as distinct from training) requirements;
- meet needs and educational aspirations of minorities and women;
- encourage cooperative higher education planning and commitment of the individual, the college and the military service as close to the point of enlistment as practicable;
- assist veterans by easing the transition from active to reserve and civilian status; and,
- encourage self-development of servicemembers, enabling them to develop into "truly educated persons."

Finally, it is essential that adult education opportunities be provided in the military for those servicemembers with basic educational deficiencies. Their educational needs should be identified, and the associated issues be addressed at policy-making levels, so that the military services get on with educational programs in this area that will work.

References

American Council on Education. (1996).*The 1996 guide to the evaluation of educational experiences in the armed services.* Washington, DC: The American Council on Education.

American Forces Information Services. (1996). *Defense 96 Almanac*. Issue 5. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Anderson, C.L. (1986). *Historical profile of adult basic education programs in the United States Army*. Unpublished Dissertation. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Anderson, C. L., Harding, S.V., & Kime, S.F. (1992). *Helping servicemembers with flawed high school education*. Unpublished Research Monograph. Presented at the 1992 American Association for Adult and Continuing Education Conference, Anaheim, CA and at the First National Developmental Education Research Conference, Charlotte, NC, November 1992.

Anderson, C.L. & Kime, S.F. (1990). Adult higher education and the military: Blending traditional and nontraditional education. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Andrulius Research Corporation. (1982). *AirLand battle 2000: Impact on U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences*. Alexandria, VA: Army Research Institute.

Berry, D.C. (1974). *Higher education in the United States Army*. New York: Carlton Press.

Brookfield, S. (1985). A critical definition of adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 36(1), pp. 44-49.

Department of the Air Force (1984). *Air Force Human Resources Laboratory annual report FY 83.* Brooks Air Force Base: TX: Air Force Human Resources Laboratory.

Hexter, H. (1987). *The military connection: Competition and cooperation with postsecondary education.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Kime, S. F. (February 3, 1997). Train first but educate, too, *Army Times,* p 27.

Kime, S. F. (March 12, 1990). Don't sacrifice education to budget cuts, *Army Times,* p.23.

Komarow, K. (January 24, 1997). Army hopes to lure recruits with incentives, *USA Today*.

Kulas, G.S. (January 6, 1997). Put military education first, *Army Times,* p.62.

Laurence, J. H.; Ramsberger, P. F.; & Gribben, M. A. (1989). *Effects of military experience on the post-service lives of low-aptitude recruits: Project 100,000 and the ASVAB misnorming.* (FR-89-29) Alexandria; VA: Human Resources Research Organization.

Mezirow, J. (1985). A critical theory of self-directed learning. In S.D. Brookfield (Ed.) *Self-directed learning: From theory to practice*, (pp. 17-30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Newman, R.J. (1996). The few, the proud, the smart, the moral, *U.S. News & World Report*, December 16, 1996, pp. 33-34.

Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) (1997). *Department of Defense Directive 1322.8: Voluntary education programs for military personnel.* Washington, DC: Author.

Shelburne, J.C. & Groves, K.J. (1965). *Education in the armed forces.* New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc.

Waggener, R. (Sep. 27, 1976). *Training versus education.* Unpublished paper. Washington, DC: HQDA (DAAG-ED).

Wilds, H.E. (1938). *Valley Forge*. New York: Macmillan.

Autobiographical Sketches

Steve F. Kime is the Director of Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges. He holds Masters and PhD degrees from Harvard. Dr. Kime has been Director of one of the four Academic Divisions at the Naval Academy and Associate Dean at The National War College. He held professorships at these military institutions and adjunct professorships at Georgetown and American Universities. He has lectured and published extensively on Russian affairs and on voluntary postsecondary education in the military. Dr. Kime is a veteran of 27 years in the Navy during which he served twice as Naval Attache to the U.S.S.R., and as an elected board member of the U.S. Naval Institute *Proceedings.* He currently also serves on the Education Advisory Committee of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Address: Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges
Suite 680, One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036
EMail: KimeS@aascu.nche.edu
Phone: 800-368 5622
FAX: 202-667 0622

Clinton L. Anderson is the Senior Consultant to Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges. He holds Masters degrees from the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill and Stanford University, and an Ed.D. degree in Adult and Higher Education from Teachers College, Columbia University. His dissertation was entitled *Historical Profile of Adult Basic Education Programs in the United States Army.* Dr. Anderson is a veteran of 20 years of Army service, during which he served seven years in Field Artillery training and over six years at Army Headquarters in the management and operation of Army's continuing education programs. Dr. Anderson also serves as the Assistant Administrator of the American Council on Education's Military Installation Voluntary Education Review (MIVER) Project.

Address: Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges
Suite 680, One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036
EMail: AndersonC@aascu.nche.edu
Phone: 800-368 5622
FAX: 202-667 0622